



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,623	10/25/2000	Wei Yen	145.1002.02	4379

22883 7590 02/23/2005
SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC
P.O. BOX 390013
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013

EXAMINER

LE, HIEU C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/696,623

Applicant(s)

YEN, WEI

Examiner

Hieu c. Le

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12-13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2142

1. The amendment filed 1/07/04 have been entered and made of record.
2. In response to Applicant's amendment filed 1/07/04, the objection to claims 12-13 is withdrawn.
3. The Applicant's argument filed 1/07/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant alleges "in claim 1, first provider information is being entered from first provider information is being entered from the provider location (i.e. client device) so as to be stored at the remote location (i.e. server device)[,] (page 13, line 13-page 14, line 2). The Examiner can not see this limitations in claim 1. More specifically there is no recitation of storing the remote location (i.e. server device) of first provider information being enter from the first provider location (i.e. client device). Claim 1 as amended reads" interacting from a first provider location with a computer program stored at a remote location (i.e. the computer program is stored at a remote location (i.e. server).

Secondly, Pasquali discloses a user device (first provider location) that downloads a software related to advertising content source from a server (i.e. computer program stored at a remote location), the clients web browser (client device) produces window object (interacting with the computer program) within the content manifestation environment provided by the web browser client (i.e. providing a first set of information) col. 2, line 66-col 3, line 25) which read on the claim as broadly claimed. Third, there is no thing in claim 1 that precludes the use of any additional software in conjunction with a standard web browser to display.

Applicant alleges " as previously stated [,] (page 14, lines 13-17). The Examiner disagrees. As explained above, claim 1, does not recite entering data at the client side to used as advertising data at the server side.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Pasquali (US Patent 6,321,209) in view of Nazem et al (US Patent 5,983,227).

As to claim 1, Pasquali discloses a method of creating a web page that can be used in dynamic system for trading good and services (see title), wherein said the method includes:

interacting from a first provider location with a computer program stored at a remote location using computerized communication system so as to provide said computer program with a first set of information concerning a first provider [(Fig. 2, server 210, item 212 ad content source (URL); a user device (first provider location) that downloads a software related to advertising content source from a server (i.e. computer program stored at a remote location), the clients web browser (client device) produces window object (interacting with the computer program) within the content manifestation environment provided by the web browser client (i.e. providing a first set of information) col. 3, line 66-col 3, line 25)].

determining a location to display said web page (col. 7, lines 36-57); and displaying said web page (col. 5, line 2-col. 6, lines 25).

Pasquali does not disclose,

Art Unit: 2142

aggregating said first set of information with at least one second set of information provided by at least one second provider.

Nazem discloses a system and method for combining (aggregating) a multiple web pages including demographic information (first set of information) and stock symbols or weather information (second set of information) (col. 5, lines 35-41);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Nazem's teaching to modify Pasquali's method by aggregating first set of information with at least one second set of information provided by at least one second provider order to avoid regularly re-entering the same multiplicity of web addresses and to avoid having to navigate through multi-level web sites to reach desired information.

As to claim 2, Pasquali further discloses wherein said step of interacting includes interacting with an application server provider (item 2 (col. 7, lines 1-64).

As to claim 5, Pasquali further discloses wherein said first set of information includes a set of interactive responses to said computer program, wherein said interactive responses includes data relating to stylistic and substantive elements included in said web page (col. 5, lines 59-65).

As to claim 6, Nazem further discloses wherein said step of aggregating includes determining a commonality between said first set of information and said second set of information (col. 5, lines 50-65, Fig. 5A, 5B);

As to claim 7, Pasquali further discloses wherein said step of determining a location includes determining at least one web site (col. 7, lines 36-57).

Art Unit: 2142

As to claim 8 , Pasquali further discloses wherein said at least one web site is logically related to said remote location of said computer program (col. 6, lines 3-55).

As to claim 9, Pasquali further discloses including the step of storing said first set of information in a database (item 204, col. 6, lines 56-67).

As to claim 10, Pasquali further discloses including the step of storing said web page in a database (col. 7, lines 1-4).

As to claim 11, refer to claim 1 rejection for their common features. Pasquali further discloses a database coupled to the server, wherein said database includes at least one record regarding a provider [(Fig. 2, item 204, col. 6, lines 1-4); and a communication link (col. 6, lines 34-43) a user device (first provider location) that downloads a software related to advertising content source from a server (i.e. computer program stored at a remote location), the clients web browser (client device) produces window object (interacting with the computer program) within the content manifestation environment provided by the web browser client (i.e. providing a first set of information) col. 3, line 66-col 3, line 25)].

As to claim 14 , Pasquali further discloses wherein said web site and said server are coupled in such a way as to be logically related (col. 6, lines 3-55).

As to claim 15 , Pasquali further discloses wherein said web site displays a plurality of said web pages (col. 5, line 2-col. 6, lines 25).

6. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

Art Unit: 2142

over by Pasquali (US Patent 5,651,006) in view of Nazem et al (US Patent 5,983,227), as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Conklin et al. (US Patent 6,338,050) .

As to claim 3, Nazem further discloses wherein said first set of information includes demographic information about the first provider (col. 5, lines 36-40).

Neither Pasquali nor Nazem discloses product information about a good or service or type of knowledge that is offered by the first provider.

Conklin discloses a system for information transaction processing which enables collecting demographic information about the first provider and product information about a good or service or type of knowledge that is offered by the first provider (col. 27, lines 24-col. 28, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Conklin's teachings to modify the combined method of Pasquali and Nazem by using product information about the good and service offered by the provider in order to provide appropriate records to document transactions of goods and services.

As to claim 4, Conklin further discloses wherein said demographic information includes information necessary for processing a payment from the first provider (col. 14, lines 1-44).

Claims 16-17 are allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 12-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2142

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu Le whose telephone number is (703) 306-3101. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey, can be reached on (703) 305-9705. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Hieu Le


JACK HARVEY
SUPERVISOR, ART UNIT EXAMINER